

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 2, 2008, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of the claims. However, the Examiner is thanked for the detailed Office Action.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16 - 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, on the basis of the *Farrell* and *Trovinger* (US 6,873,426 and US 6,708,967, respectively). Claims 3, 6, 9, 12 and 15 were rejected on the basis of *Farrell* and *Trovinger*, in view of *Jeyachandran* (US 6,567,176). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reason that the *Farrell* patent does not disclose the claimed subject matter that is attributed to it in the Office Action.

Claim 1 recites, among other elements, a printing system having an on-line client, print server and printer, and an off-line finishing device. The claim recites that the print server includes a first memory for *storing specifications of the on-line printer and of the off-line finishing device*, as well as information regarding options installed thereon. Claim 1 further includes a creating unit for creating data for a finishing device job ticket that includes the finishing specifics separated by the sorter and assigned to the off-line finishing device. Because of the memory, the print server is able to create a finishing device job ticket that includes only functions that can be performed by the off-line finishing device. This avoids creating a ticket having functions that cannot be performed by the off-line finishing device.

At the bottom of page 11 of the Official Action, it is stated that *Farrell* discloses a printing system that includes a print server that has a memory for storing specifications of the off-line finishing device as well as information regarding options

installed thereon. However, no such teaching can be found in *Farrell* of a memory that stores specifications of an off-line finishing device to which a finishing device job ticket is directed. Accordingly, as set forth above, the *Farrell* device is not able to create a finishing device job ticket that includes only functions that can be performed by the off-line finishing device.

This deficiency is not overcome by the remaining references. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the applied prior art.

The remaining claims 2 – 16 are also patentable at least for the same or similar reasons.

To further define the protection to which applicants are entitled, new claims 22 – 26 have been added. New independent claim 22 recites a printing system that includes an on-line client; a print server; an on-line printer having at least one first finishing feature; and a finishing device having at least one second finishing feature. The print server includes a first memory for storing specifications of the on-line printer and of the finishing device, as well as information regarding the first and second finishing features; a receiver for receiving from the client data pertaining to a job ticket that includes at least finishing specifics to be executed; a sorter for, based on the information regarding the specifications and the first and second finishing features that is stored in the first memory, separating the finishing specifics included in the job ticket received by the receiver into those to be performed by the on-line printer and those to be performed by the finishing device; a setting unit for setting, in the on-line printer, the parameters for the finishing specifics as separated by the sorter and assigned to the on-line printer; and a creating unit for creating data for a

finishing device job ticket that includes the finishing specifics separated by the sorter and assigned to the finishing device.

Because of the memory, the print server is able to create a finishing device job ticket that includes only functions that can be performed by the finishing device. This avoids creating a ticket having functions that cannot be performed by the finishing device.

At the bottom of page 11 of the Official Action, it is stated that *Farrell* discloses a printing system that includes a print server that has a memory for storing specifications of the finishing device as well as information regarding options installed thereon. However, no such teaching can be found in *Farrell* of a memory that stores specifications of a finishing device to which a finishing device job ticket is directed. Accordingly, as set forth above, the *Farrell* device is not able to create a finishing device job ticket that includes only functions that can be performed by the finishing device.

This deficiency is not overcome by the remaining references. Accordingly, claim 22 is patentable over the applied prior art. Claims 23 – 25 are also patentable at least for the same or similar reasons.

New claim 26 recites a printing system comprising an on-line client; a print server; an on-line printer having at least one first finishing feature; and a finishing device having at least one second finishing feature. The print server includes a receiver for receiving from the client data pertaining to a job ticket that includes at least finishing specifics to be executed; a sorter for, based on the information regarding the first and second finishing features, separating the finishing specifics included in the job ticket received by the receiver into those to be performed by the

on-line printer and those to be performed by the finishing device; a setting unit for setting, in the on-line printer, the parameters for the finishing specifics as separated by the sorter and assigned to the on-line printer; and a creating unit for creating data for a finishing device job ticket that includes the finishing specifics separated by the sorter and assigned to the finishing device.

Thus, the print server is able to create a finishing device job ticket that includes only functions that can be performed by the finishing device. This avoids creating a ticket having functions that cannot be performed by the finishing device. The *Farrell* device is not able to create a finishing device job ticket that includes only functions that can be performed by the finishing device.

This deficiency is not overcome by the remaining references. Accordingly, claim 26 is also patentable over the applied prior art.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: April 2, 2008

By: William C. Rowland
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620